

HARMONIC AND SUPERHARMONIC MAJORANTS ON THE DISK

ALEXANDER BORICHEV ARTUR NICOLAU PASCAL J. THOMAS

ABSTRACT. We prove that a positive function on the unit disk admits a harmonic majorant if and only if a certain logarithmic Lipschitz upper envelope of it (relevant because of the Harnack inequality) admits a superharmonic majorant. We discuss the logarithmic Lipschitz regularity of this superharmonic majorant, and show that in general it cannot be better than that of the Poisson kernel. We provide examples to show that mere superharmonicity of the data does not help with the problem of existence of a harmonic majorant.

1. DEFINITIONS AND STATEMENTS

Let $\mathbb{D}$ stand for the open unit disk in the complex plane, and $H^+(\mathbb{D})$ for the cone of positive harmonic functions on $\mathbb{D}$. We would like to describe the functions $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ which admit a harmonic majorant, that is, $h \in H^+(\mathbb{D})$ such that $h \geq \varphi$. This question arises in problems about the decrease of bounded holomorphic functions in the unit disk, as well as in the description of free interpolating sequences for the Nevanlinna class (see [HMNT]). In that paper, an answer is given in terms of duality with the measures that act on positive harmonic functions. The aim of this note is to reduce this problem first to the finiteness of a certain best Lipschitz majorant function, and then to the existence of a merely *superharmonic* (nontrivial) majorant.

Let the hyperbolic (or Poincaré) distance ρ on the disk be defined by $d\rho(z) := (1 - |z|^2)^{-1}|dz|$. This is invariant under biholomorphic maps from the disk to itself. Explicitly, if we first define the pseudohyperbolic (or Gleason) distance by

$$d(z, w) := \left| \frac{z - w}{1 - \bar{z}w} \right|,$$

then

$$(1.1) \quad \rho(z, w) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1 + d(z, w)}{1 - d(z, w)}.$$

For $h \in H^+(\mathbb{D})$, the classical Harnack inequality reads, for $0 < r < 1$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{1 - r}{1 + r} h(0) \leq h(re^{i\theta}) \leq \frac{1 + r}{1 - r} h(0).$$

Key words and phrases. harmonic majorants, positive harmonic functions, superharmonic functions, Harnack inequality ; *2000 Mathematics Subject Classification* 31A05.

All authors supported by the PICS program no 1019 of Generalitat de Catalunya and CNRS. First and second author also supported by European Commission Research Training Network HPRN-CT-2000-00116. Second author supported by DGICYT grant BFM2002-00571 and the CIRIT grant 2001-SGR00431.

This implies that the function $\log h$ is Lipschitz with constant 2 with respect to the hyperbolic distance. We will say that a positive valued function F is *Log-Lipschitz* (with constant C) if and only if $|\log F(z) - \log F(w)| \leq C\rho(z, w)$ for all $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$.

Theorem 1. *If φ admits a superharmonic and Log-Lipschitz majorant with constant $C \geq 2$, then φ admits a harmonic majorant.*

Since the infimum of two harmonic functions is not in general harmonic, there is no smallest harmonic majorant for a given function. On the other hand, the cone $Sp(\mathbb{D})$ of superharmonic functions is stable under finite infima. Denote by $R(\varphi)$ the reduced function of φ , i.e.

$$R(\varphi)(z) := \inf\{u(z) : u \in Sp(\mathbb{D}), u \geq \varphi \text{ on } \mathbb{D}\}$$

(see e.g. [Es]). We use the convention that $R(\varphi) \equiv \infty$ if there is no (non identically infinite) superharmonic majorant. The reduced function could also be called “superharmonic envelope” as in [Ra]. The reduced function is not in general superharmonic, because it can fail to be lower semicontinuous. J. W. Green [Gr, Theorem 2] proved that when φ is continuous, then $R(\varphi)$, if finite, is also continuous, therefore superharmonic, so the infimum in its definition is really a minimum; furthermore, it is harmonic in the open set $\{z : R(\varphi)(z) > \varphi(z)\}$.

If instead of taking the infimum of all superharmonic functions above φ , we restrict ourselves to those which are Log-Lipschitz with a given constant C , the corresponding infimum $R_C(\varphi)$ (if finite) will again be Log-Lipschitz with constant C , hence will be the smallest Log-Lipschitz superharmonic majorant of φ with constant C . Theorem 1 means that φ admits a harmonic majorant if and only if $R_C(\varphi)$ is finite.

In order to study the finiteness of $R_C(\varphi)$, it would be nice to be able to proceed in two steps, first dealing with the Lipschitz property, then with superharmonicity. The smallest Log-Lipschitz majorant with constant C of a given nonnegative function φ is (see [McS], or [HU] for a more recent survey)

$$L_C(\varphi)(z) = \exp\left\{\sup_{w \in \mathbb{D}} (\varphi(w) - C\rho(w, z))\right\}.$$

Clearly, $L_C(\varphi) \leq R_C(\varphi)$, thus $R(L_C(\varphi)) \leq R_C(\varphi)$. That inequality can be strict when $C < 2$.

Proposition 2. *For every $0 < \gamma \leq \beta < 2$ there exists a bounded positive function H on the disc such that*

$$R(L_\gamma(H)) \neq R_\beta(H).$$

But we don’t know whether $R(L_C(\varphi)) = R_C(\varphi)$ holds for $C \geq 2$. Nevertheless, if a Log-Lipschitz function admits a superharmonic majorant s , then the invariant averages of s will provide us with a superharmonic majorant with a weak Log-Lipschitz property, and finally we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3. *If there exists $C > 0$ such that $L_C(\varphi)$ admits a superharmonic majorant, then φ admits a harmonic majorant.*

Note that it would not help to perform our two steps in the reverse order. Typical data for many problem of harmonic majorants are functions φ which vanish everywhere except on a discrete subset [HMNT]. For such φ , $R(\varphi) = \varphi$.

Of course, Theorem 3 begs the question of criteria to ensure the finiteness of the reduced function of Log-Lipschitz data. In this general direction, one should note results of Koosis [Ko, p. 77] and Cole and Ransford [CR, Theorem 1.3] which imply that when φ is merely continuous,

$$R\varphi(x) = \sup\left\{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_x\right\} = \sup\left\{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in H_x\right\},$$

where I_x denotes the set of Jensen measures for x , and H_x denotes the set of harmonic measures for x with respect to a domain $\omega \subset \subset \mathbb{D}$. A perhaps more computable characterization of $R\varphi$ is given by [Ko, Théorème, p. 80] : let $D_H(z, r)$ stand for the disc of center z and radius r with respect to the hyperbolic distance ρ , and $d\beta(z) := (1 - |z|^2)^{-2} d\lambda_2(z)$ be the invariant measure on the disk. Given a real-valued continuous function on $\mathbb{D}$, let

$$MF(z) := \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(z, r))} \int_{D_H(z, r)} F(w) d\beta(w),$$

and define $F^{(0)} := F$, $F^{(k+1)} := MF^{(k)}$. Then, arguing as in [Ko], one can check that

$$R\varphi(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi^{(n)}(z).$$

So, Theorem 3 says that φ admits a harmonic majorant if and only if the sequence $L_C(\varphi)^{(n)}(0)$ remains bounded.

Counterexamples.

We want to see that the a priori assumption of superharmonicity upon the data, in contrast to the assumption of a Lipschitz type property, does not improve the prospect for the existence of a harmonic majorant. A result of that type can be given as follows. First recall that a necessary condition for the existence of a harmonic majorant can be given in terms of nontangential maximal functions.

The Stolz angle with vertex at some point $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ is defined by

$$\Gamma_\alpha(\zeta) := \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |z - \zeta| \leq \alpha(1 - |z|^2)\}.$$

Given a function f from $\mathbb{D}$ to $\mathbb{R}_+$, the nontangential maximal function is defined as

$$Mf(\zeta) := \max_{\Gamma_\alpha(\zeta)} f.$$

Finally, for a function g from some measure space (X, μ) to $\mathbb{R}_+$, we write that $g \in L_w^1(X)$ (“weakly integrable functions”) if and only if there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\mu(g \geq \lambda) \leq C/\lambda, \text{ for all } \lambda > 0.$$

It is a well-known and easy fact that if φ admits a harmonic majorant, then $M\varphi \in L_w^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ (see [HMNT, Proposition 1.5], [PT1, Lemma 14, p. 6], [PT2, Lemma 5, p. 6]). This condition can’t be improved in a quantitative way, even for superharmonic data.

For notational convenience, the examples below are given in the upper-half plane $U_+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im} z > 0\}$. Stolz angles are then defined as

$$\Gamma_\alpha(t) := \{z = x + iy \in U_+ : |x - t| \leq \alpha y\}.$$

Proposition 4. *For any decreasing function s from $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ to $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = 0$ and $\int_1^\infty s(t)dt = \infty$, there exists a positive superharmonic function φ on U_+ such that*

$$|\{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : M\varphi(\xi) > t\}| \leq s(t) \text{ for any } t > 0 \text{ large enough,}$$

but there does not exist any harmonic function $h \in Ha(U_+)$ such that $h(z) \geq \varphi(z)$ for all $z \in U_+$.

Here, as in various further instances, $|\cdot|$ stands for one-dimensional Lebesgue measure on the real line or on the circle.

Examples of the same type allow us to show that no condition relying solely on the rate of increase of φ near the boundary can be sufficient to imply that φ is dominated by some harmonic function, even assuming as above that φ be superharmonic.

Proposition 5. *For any decreasing function s from $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ to $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} s(t) = \infty$, there exists a positive superharmonic function φ on U_+ such that*

$$\varphi(x + iy) \leq s(y), \text{ for any } x + iy \in U_+, y \text{ small enough,}$$

but there does not exist any harmonic function $h \in Ha(U_+)$ such that $h(z) \geq \varphi(z)$ for all $z \in U_+$.

Observe that Proposition 5 would be very easy if we allowed φ to be subharmonic; then it would be enough to select $\varphi(x + iy) := s_1(y)$, with s_1 the lower convex envelope of s . This remark is made to stress the difference between our problem and the more classical question of harmonic majorants of subharmonic functions.

The paper is organized as follows. The next section is devoted to studying the dyadic analogue of the problem of harmonic majorants. Theorems 1 and 3 are proved in sections 3 and 5 respectively. Proposition 2 is proved in section 4. The other counterexamples are given in the last section of the paper.

2. A DISCRETE MODEL

Recall that any positive harmonic function h is the Poisson integral of a finite positive measure μ on the boundary of the disk, $h(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} P_z(e^{i\theta}) d\mu(\theta)$, where

$$P_z(e^{i\theta}) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{(1 - |z|^2)}{|z - e^{i\theta}|^2}.$$

The following considerations concern the simpler case of functions which are generated by the “square” kernel

$$K_z(e^{i\theta}) := \frac{1}{|I_z|} \chi_{I_z}(e^{i\theta}), \text{ where } I_z := \{e^{i\theta} : z \in \Gamma_\alpha(e^{i\theta})\}.$$

Here χ_E stands for the characteristic function of the set E . The “square” integral of a finite measure μ is defined by $\int_0^{2\pi} K_z(e^{i\theta}) d\mu(\theta) = \mu(I_z)/|I_z|$.

Consider the usual partition of $\partial\mathbb{D}$ in dyadic arcs, for any n in $\mathbb{Z}_+$:

$$I_{n,k} := \{e^{i\theta} : \theta \in [2\pi k 2^{-n}, 2\pi(k+1)2^{-n})\}, \quad 0 \leq k < 2^n.$$

Note that $|I_{n,k}| = 2\pi 2^{-n}$. To this subdivision we associate the Whitney partition in “dyadic squares” of the unit disk :

$$Q_{n,k} := \{re^{i\theta} : e^{i\theta} \in I_{n,k}, 1 - 2^{-n} \leq r < 1 - 2^{-n-1}\}.$$

It is well known and easy to see that there exists a constant c_α such that for any $z \in Q_{n,k}$, $P_z \geq c_\alpha K_{I_{n,k}}$. This implies that sufficient conditions for majorization by “ K -harmonic functions” yield sufficient conditions for majorization by (true) harmonic functions.

Theorem 6. *Given a collection of nonnegative data $\{p_{n,k}\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists a finite positive measure μ on $\partial\mathbb{D}$ such that*

$$\frac{\mu(I_{n,k})}{|I_{n,k}|} \geq p_{n,k}$$

if and only if there exists a constant S such that

$$(2.1) \quad \sum p_{n,k} |I_{n,k}| \leq S$$

where the sum is taken over any disjoint family of dyadic arcs $\{I_{n,k}\}$.

Proof. The condition is clearly necessary with $S = \mu(\partial\mathbb{D})$. To prove the converse direction, let us consider the following modified data:

$$\tilde{p}_{n,k} := \frac{1}{|I_{n,k}|} \sup \left\{ \sum p_{q,j} |I_{q,j}| \right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over any disjoint family $\{I_{q,j}\}$ of dyadic subintervals of $I_{n,k}$. Observe that $\tilde{p}_{n,k} \geq p_{n,k}$, and that $\tilde{p}_{n,k}$ verifies the following discrete superharmonicity property :

$$\tilde{p}_{n,k} \geq \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}_{n+1,2k} + \tilde{p}_{n+1,2k+1}).$$

Assuming (2.1) we will construct a sequence of positive measures μ_n of bounded total mass, uniformly distributed on each interval $I_{n,j}$, such that for all $m \leq n$,

$$(2.2) \quad \mu_n(I_{m,k}) \geq |I_{m,k}| \tilde{p}_{m,k}.$$

Let μ_0 be the uniform measure of total mass S on the interval $I_{0,0} = \partial\mathbb{D}$. The hypothesis (2.1) coincides with (2.2) in this case. Suppose that μ_m , $m \leq n$ have already been constructed satisfying (2.2), we will choose μ_{n+1} . Fix j , $0 \leq j < 2^n$. Then $I_{n,j} = I_{n+1,2j} \cup I_{n+1,2j+1}$, so (2.2) implies in particular that

$$\mu_n(I_{n,j}) \geq |I_{n+1,2j}| \tilde{p}_{n+1,2j} + |I_{n+1,2j+1}| \tilde{p}_{n+1,2j+1},$$

so we find $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ such that

$$\mu_n(I_{n,j}) = \alpha + \beta, \quad \alpha \geq |I_{n+1,2j}| \tilde{p}_{n+1,2j}, \quad \beta \geq |I_{n+1,2j+1}| \tilde{p}_{n+1,2j+1}.$$

We set $\mu_{n+1}(I_{n+1,2j}) = \alpha$, $\mu_{n+1}(I_{n+1,2j+1}) = \beta$. This defines a measure μ_{n+1} which verifies (2.2) at rank $n+1$ for $m = n+1$. It also satisfies

$$\mu_{n+1}(I_{m,j}) = \mu_n(I_{m,j}), \quad \forall m \leq n,$$

so (2.2) is verified by μ_{n+1} for all $m \leq n+1$. This bounded sequence of measures contains a weakly convergent subsequence, whose limit μ will satisfy the condition in the Theorem. $\square$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We will prove the following slightly more general fact, which will be useful in Section 5.

Proposition 7. *Let u be a positive superharmonic function on the disk satisfying that for any $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$,*

$$(3.1) \quad |\log v(z) - \log v(w)| \leq C_1(1 + \rho(z, w)).$$

Then there exists $h \in H^+(\mathbb{D})$ such that $h \geq u$.

Proof. The Riesz representation theorem tells us that there exists a positive measure $\nu = -\Delta u$ in the sense of distributions, and a positive harmonic function h_0 such that

$$u(z) = h_0(z) + \int_{\mathbb{D}} \log \frac{1}{d(z, w)} d\nu(w) =: h_0(z) + u_0(z).$$

Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ to be chosen later, then

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(z) &= \int_{\{w: d(z, w) \leq \delta\}} \log \frac{1}{d(z, w)} d\nu(w) + \int_{\{w: d(z, w) > \delta\}} \log \frac{1}{d(z, w)} d\nu(w) \\ &=: u_1(z) + u_2(z). \end{aligned}$$

For $d(z, w) > \delta$, we have

$$\log \frac{1}{d(z, w)} \leq C_\delta \frac{1 - |zw|^2}{|1 - z\bar{w}|^2} (1 - |w|^2),$$

which is harmonic in z . Note that

$$(3.2) \quad \infty > u(0) \geq \int_{\mathbb{D}} \log \frac{1}{|w|} d\nu(w) \geq \int_{\mathbb{D}} (1 - |w|) d\nu(w),$$

so that the harmonic function

$$h_2(z) := C_\delta \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{1 - |zw|^2}{|1 - z\bar{w}|^2} (1 - |w|^2) d\nu(w)$$

is bigger than u_2 . Now we only need to find a harmonic majorant for the remaining term u_1 .

A sequence $\{z_k\} \subset \mathbb{D}$ is called *uniformly dense* if there exists $0 < r_1 < r_2$ satisfying

- (1) $D_H(z_j, r_1) \cap D_H(z_k, r_1) = \emptyset$ for any $j \neq k$,
- (2) $\mathbb{D} \subset \cup_k D_H(z_k, r_2)$.

Recall that $D_H(z, r)$ is the hyperbolic disk with center z and radius r .

Lemma 8. *For $\delta \in (0, 1)$ a properly chosen absolute constant, there exist a uniformly dense sequence $\{z_k\}$ and a positive harmonic function h_1 such that for any k , $u_1(z_k) \leq h_1(z_k)$.*

Accepting this Lemma, we can easily finish the proof: if we write $h_3 := h_0 + h_1 + h_2$, we see that we have $u(z_k) \leq h_3(z_k)$, for any k . Now by Harnack's inequality, for any $z \in D_H(z_k, r_2)$, $h_3(z) \geq e^{-2r_2} h_3(z_k)$; while by (3.1) —note that this is the only step in this argument where this hypothesis is used—

$$u(z) \leq \exp[C_1(1 + r_2)] u(z_k) \leq \exp[C_1(1 + r_2)] h_3(z_k) \leq \exp[C_1(1 + r_2)] e^{2r_2} h_3(z).$$

So we have found a harmonic majorant of u . □

Proof of Lemma 8

First let $T_{n,j} := \{z \in Q_{n,j} : \rho(z, \partial Q_{n,j}) > \delta\}$. For δ small enough, denoting by m the 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure on the plane,

$$m(Q_{n,j}) \geq m(T_{n,j}) \geq C(\delta)m(Q_{n,j}).$$

Choose in each $T_{n,j}$ a point $z_{n,j}$ such that

$$u_1(z_{n,j}) \leq \frac{1}{m(T_{n,j})} \int_{T_{n,j}} u_1(\zeta) dm(\zeta).$$

It is enough to estimate this last average. We apply Fubini's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m(T_{n,j})} \int_{T_{n,j}} u_1(z) dm(z) &= \frac{1}{m(T_{n,j})} \int_{T_{n,j}} \int_{\{w: d(z,w) \leq \delta\}} \log \frac{1}{d(z,w)} d\nu(w) dm(\zeta) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m(T_{n,j})} \int_{Q_{n,j}} \left(\int_{T_{n,j}} \log \frac{1}{d(z,w)} dm(z) \right) d\nu(w) \leq C \int_{Q_{n,j}} d\nu(w), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the following explicit estimate : for $w \in Q_{n,j}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T_{n,j}} \log \frac{1}{d(z,w)} dm(z) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \log \frac{1}{2^{-k-1}} m(\{z : 2^{-k-1} < d(w,z) \leq 2^{-k}\}) \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k 2^{-2n-2k} \leq C 2^{-2n} \leq C m(T_{n,j}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we set

$$p_{n,j} := \frac{1}{|I_{n,j}|} \int_{Q_{n,j}} (1 - |w|) d\nu(w) \approx \int_{Q_{n,j}} d\nu(w).$$

Since the “squares” $Q_{n,j}$ are disjoint, the condition (3.2) implies that

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{n,j} |I_{n,j}| p_{n,j} < \infty.$$

Hence, $\{p_{n,j}\}$ satisfies (2.1) and Theorem 6 provides a positive measure μ on the unit circle such that for any dyadic arc $I_{n,j}$,

$$(3.4) \quad \mu(I_{n,j}) \geq |I_{n,j}| p_{n,j}.$$

However, whenever condition (3.3) is verified, a more direct construction can be applied. Namely, one may take $d\mu = f(e^{i\theta})d\theta$ where

$$f(e^{i\theta}) := \sum_{I_{n,k} \ni e^{i\theta}} p_{n,k}.$$

Observe that $\int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{i\theta})d\theta = \sum |I_{n,k}| p_{n,k}$, and since $f(e^{i\theta}) \geq p_{n,k}$ whenever $e^{i\theta} \in I_{n,k}$, the measure μ satisfies (3.4).

Then, by the remarks before Theorem 6, there exists a harmonic function h_1 such that

$$h_1(z_{n,j}) \geq C p_{n,j} \geq C \int_{Q_{n,j}} d\nu(w) \geq u_1(z_{n,j}).$$

□

4. PROOF OF PROPOSTION 2

The gist of this proof is that the Poisson kernel itself cannot be log-Lipschitz with a constant better than 2.

Denote $f(z) = \operatorname{Re} \frac{1+z}{1-z} = P_z(1)$. Fix $\gamma > 0$. For small $\delta > 0$ consider the function

$$g(z) = f((1-\delta)z),$$

positive and harmonic in $\frac{1}{1-\delta}\mathbb{D}$. For $0 < \varepsilon < \delta/2$ consider

$$g_\varepsilon(z) = g\left(\frac{z}{1-\varepsilon}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Denote

$$M_\delta = \sup_{0 < \varepsilon < \delta/2, z \in \mathbb{D}} \|\nabla(\log g_\varepsilon)(z)\|.$$

Put

$$h(z) = g_\varepsilon(z), \quad z \in (1-\varepsilon)\partial\mathbb{D}.$$

Claim. For sufficiently small $\varepsilon < \delta/2$, for any $w \in (1-\varepsilon)\partial\mathbb{D}$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, then

$$|\log g_\varepsilon(w) - \log g_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M_\delta |z - w| \leq \gamma \rho(z, w),$$

where ρ is defined as in (1.1).

Applying this to the special case where $z \in (1-\varepsilon)\partial\mathbb{D}$, we see that for sufficiently small ε , $\log h$ satisfies the Lipschitz condition with respect to ρ with constant γ .

Consider the γ -log-Lipschitz (with respect to ρ) extension of h to $\mathbb{D}$:

$$H(z) = \sup_{w \in (1-\varepsilon)\partial\mathbb{D}} h(w) e^{-\gamma \rho(w, z)}.$$

It also follows from the Claim that for sufficiently small $\varepsilon < \delta/2$,

$$H \leq g_\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

Proof of the Claim.

To prove the second inequality, note that if $\left|\frac{z-w}{1-z\bar{w}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $|1-z\bar{w}| \leq u(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and then (since $\log \frac{1+s}{1-s} \geq 2s$, $0 \leq s < 1$)

$$2\rho(w, z) \geq 2\left|\frac{z-w}{1-z\bar{w}}\right| \geq \frac{2}{u(\varepsilon)}|z-w|.$$

If $\left|\frac{z-w}{1-z\bar{w}}\right| > \frac{1}{2}$, and $|z-w| \leq \frac{\gamma}{2M_\delta}$, then

$$2\rho(w, z) \geq \log 3 > 1 \geq \frac{2M_\delta}{\gamma}|z-w|.$$

Finally, if $|z-w| > \frac{\gamma}{2M_\delta}$, then

$$\left|\frac{z-w}{1-z\bar{w}}\right| \geq 1 - u_1\left(\varepsilon, \frac{\gamma}{2M_\delta}\right),$$

where $u_1\left(\varepsilon, \frac{\gamma}{2M_\delta}\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and

$$2\rho(w, z) \geq \log \frac{1}{u_1\left(\varepsilon, \frac{\gamma}{2M_\delta}\right)} \geq \frac{2M_\delta}{\gamma},$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of our Claim.

By definition of H , we have $L_\gamma(H) = H$.

Since $R(H)$ is superharmonic, and H coincides with g_ε on $(1 - \varepsilon)\partial\mathbb{D}$, with g_ε harmonic in $\mathbb{D}$, we obtain

$$R(H) \geq g_\varepsilon \quad \text{on } (1 - \varepsilon)\mathbb{D}.$$

Furthermore, since $H \leq g_\varepsilon$ on $\mathbb{D}$,

$$R(H) \leq g_\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

As a result,

$$R(H) = g_\varepsilon \quad \text{on } (1 - \varepsilon)\mathbb{D},$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\log R(H))(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\log g_\varepsilon)(0) = \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - \varepsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\log f)(0) = 2 \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, the function $R(H)$ is no better than $2 \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - \varepsilon}$ -log-Lipschitz, and

$$R(L_\gamma(H)) = R(H) \neq R_c(H), \quad c < 2 \frac{1 - \delta}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

This completes the proof.

5. COMPARISON OF UPPER ENVELOPES

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 3. Proposition 7 shows that it will follow from the following result.

Lemma 9. *Given $C_0 > 0$, there is a $C_1 \geq C_0$ such that if φ is Log-Lipschitz with constant C_0 , and admits a non-trivial superharmonic majorant, then there exists a superharmonic function v such that $v \geq \varphi$ and v verifies (3.1) with constant C_1 .*

Proof. Let $u \in Sp(\mathbb{D})$ such that $u \geq \varphi$. We will notice (Lemma 10) that an averaged version of u always satisfies (3.1), and that (up to a multiplicative constant) it provides the regular superharmonic majorant we are looking for.

For any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, let $D_H(z, \delta)$ stand, as above, for a hyperbolic disk of radius δ centered at z . Let $d\beta(z) := (1 - |z|^2)^{-2} dm(z)$ be the invariant measure on the disk. For any Möbius automorphism ϕ of the disk, any measurable function f and any measurable set E , we have (see e.g. [St, (2.19), p. 19])

$$\int_E f \circ \phi d\beta = \int_{\phi(E)} f d\beta.$$

For any measurable function g on the unit disk, let

$$g_\delta(z) := \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(z, \delta))} \int_{D_H(z, \delta)} g d\beta.$$

Since φ is Log-Lipschitz with constant C_0 , we have $\varphi(w) \geq e^{-C_0\delta} \varphi(z)$ for any $w \in D_H(z, \delta)$, so that, being an average of such values, $\varphi_\delta(z) \geq e^{-C_0\delta} \varphi(z)$. Now $\varphi \leq u$ implies that

$$\varphi(z) \leq e^{C_0\delta} \varphi_\delta(z) \leq e^{C_0\delta} u_\delta(z).$$

The proof of Lemma 9 will conclude with the next two Lemmas. □

Lemma 10. *There exists an absolute constant κ such that for any positive valued superharmonic function u , and for any z, w in the unit disk such that $d(z, w) \leq \delta/4$, one has $u_\delta(w) \leq \kappa u_\delta(z)$, and therefore u_δ verifies (3.1).*

Proof. Recall that since u is superharmonic, for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $r_1 < r_2$,

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(z, r_1))} \int_{D_H(z, r_1)} u \, d\beta \geq \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(z, r_2))} \int_{D_H(z, r_2)} u \, d\beta.$$

Pick a constant $K < 1$ such that $\rho(z, w) \leq \delta/4$ implies that $D_H(w, K\delta) \subset D_H(z, \delta)$. Then (5.1) implies

$$u_\delta(w) \leq u_{K\delta}(w) \leq \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(w, K\delta))} \int_{D_H(w, K\delta)} u \, d\beta,$$

by the inclusion of discs and positivity of u . But

$$\frac{1}{\beta(D_H(w, K\delta))} \int_{D_H(w, K\delta)} u \, d\beta \leq \kappa \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(z, \delta))} \int_{D_H(z, \delta)} u \, d\beta = \kappa u_\delta(z),$$

since $\beta(D_H(w, K\delta))$ and $\beta(D_H(z, \delta))$ are comparable. $\square$

Lemma 11. *Let u be a positive superharmonic function on the disc. Then u_δ is also superharmonic.*

Proof. We will follow the notations and use the results of [St, Chapter 4, pp. 34–39], itself inspired by [Ul]. Let ϕ_z denote the unique involutive Möbius automorphism of the disk which exchanges z and 0. Define the invariant convolution of two measurable functions by

$$f * g(z) := \int_{\mathbb{D}} f(w) g \circ \phi_z(w) \, d\beta(w),$$

whenever the integral makes sense. This operation is commutative [St, bottom of page 34]. If we set

$$\Omega_\delta(z) := \frac{1}{\beta(D_H(0, \delta))} \chi_{D_H(0, \delta)}(z),$$

then $f_\delta = f * \Omega_\delta$. Note that $D_H(0, \delta) = D(0, \tanh \delta)$ so that Ω_δ is a radial function.

The $\mathcal{M}$ -subharmonic functions defined in [St, Chapter 4, (4.1)] reduce for $n = 1$ to ordinary subharmonic functions. The invariant Laplacian (Laplace-Beltrami operator for the Bergman metric of the ball) reduces in the case $n = 1$ to

$$\tilde{\Delta} = 2(1 - |z|^2)^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z \partial \bar{z}},$$

so that $\mathcal{C}^2$ superharmonic functions g can be characterized as those such that $\tilde{\Delta}g \leq 0$. Since our function Ω_δ is not smooth, we need to perform an approximation argument. It will be enough to show that $u * \Omega_\delta$ can be approximated from below by an increasing sequence of $\mathcal{C}^2$ superharmonic functions. Pick an increasing sequence of smooth, nonnegative, *radial* functions $\Omega_{\delta, n}$ so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_{\delta, n} = \Omega_\delta$ almost everywhere. Then the monotone convergence theorem tells us that $u * \Omega_{\delta, n}$ converges to $u * \Omega_\delta$, and the sequence is clearly increasing. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{D})$, by [St, (4.11), p. 36],

$$(\tilde{\Delta}f)(a) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{4}{r^2} [(f * \Omega_r)(a) - f(a)].$$

Now, twice applying Ulrich's lemma about associativity of the invariant convolution when the middle element is radial [St, Lemma 4.5, p. 36], we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Delta}(u * \Omega_{\delta,n}) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{4}{r^2} [(u * \Omega_{\delta,n}) * \Omega_r - u * \Omega_{\delta,n}] = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{4}{r^2} [u * (\Omega_{\delta,n} * \Omega_r) - u * \Omega_{\delta,n}] \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{4}{r^2} [u * (\Omega_r * \Omega_{\delta,n}) - u * \Omega_{\delta,n}] = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{4}{r^2} [(u * \Omega_r) * \Omega_{\delta,n} - u * \Omega_{\delta,n}] \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{4}{r^2} [(u * \Omega_r - u) * \Omega_{\delta,n}].\end{aligned}$$

Since u is superharmonic, $u * \Omega_r - u \leq 0$, and since $\Omega_{\delta,n} \geq 0$, we finally have $\tilde{\Delta}(u * \Omega_{\delta,n}) \leq 0$. $\square$

6. COUNTEREXAMPLES

We recall that for $z, w \in U_+$, the Gleason distance is given by $d(z, w) = \left| \frac{z-w}{z-\bar{w}} \right|$, and again $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1+d}{1-d}$. For a sequence $\{z_k = x_k + iy_k\}$, the Blaschke condition reads

$$\sum_k \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k|^2} < \infty,$$

which reduces to $\sum_k y_k < \infty$ when the sequence is bounded. Finally, the Blaschke product with zeroes at the z_k is

$$B(z) := \prod_k \frac{z - z_k}{z - \bar{z}_k}.$$

6.1. Construction of the examples. We shall use a monotone increasing function f from $(0, 1]$ to $(0, 1]$ satisfying $f(t) \leq t$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} f(t)/t = 0$, and there exists a constant $C_0 > 1$ such that $f(t/2) \geq f(t)/C_0$ and $f(3t/2) \leq C_0 f(t)$. For instance, any function of the form $f(t) = t^m$, for $m > 1$ will satisfy those conditions.

Define an arc γ in U_+ by $\gamma(x) := x + if(x)$, $0 < x \leq 1$. Pick a sequence of points $a_k := x_k + if(x_k)$ on γ such that $x_0 = 1$, $\{x_k\}$ decreases towards 0, and $\rho(x_k, x_{k+1}) = 2\delta > 0$ is constant, with $\delta < 1/2$ to be specified later.

It is easy to see that the sequence $\{a_k\}$ is interpolating (each Carleson window of size $f(x_k)$ around the point a_k can contain at most a fixed finite number of other points in the sequence), so the Blaschke product B associated to the sequence will verify

$$(6.1) \quad \log \frac{1}{|B(z)|} \leq C_\delta + \log \frac{1}{d(a_k, z)}, \text{ for any } z \in D_H(a_k, \delta).$$

Now, given a decreasing function σ from $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ to $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) = \infty$, if we set $\varphi_\sigma(x + iy) := \sigma(|x| + y)$, we have $M\varphi_\sigma(\xi) = \sigma(|\xi|)$, therefore $|\{M\varphi > t\}| = 2\sigma^{-1}(t)$ (where σ^{-1} stands for the inverse function).

Lemma 12. *There exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that if B_0 stands for the Blaschke product associated to the sequence $\{a_k, k \geq k_0\}$, then the following function*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(z) &:= \log \frac{1}{|B_0(z)|}, \text{ if } z \notin \bigcup_{k \geq k_0} D_H(a_k, \delta), \\ \varphi(z) &:= \min \left(\log \frac{1}{|B_0(z)|}, \min_{D_H(a_k, \delta/2)} \varphi_\sigma \right), \text{ if } z \in D_H(a_k, \delta) \text{ for some } k \geq k_0 \end{aligned}$$

is superharmonic on U_+ .

Notice that the definition of φ and the fact that $\log \frac{1}{|B_0|}$ is bounded outside of $\bigcup_{k \geq k_0} D_H(a_k, \delta)$ imply that $\varphi \leq \max(C_1, \varphi_\sigma)$ for some $C_1 > 0$, and therefore for $t > C_1$,

$$(6.2) \quad |\{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : M\varphi(\xi) > t\}| \leq 2\sigma^{-1}(t).$$

Proof of Lemma 12:

Since $\log \frac{1}{|B_0|}$ is superharmonic, it will be enough to show that

$$(6.3) \quad \min \left(\log \frac{1}{|B_0(z)|}, \min_{D_H(a_k, \delta/2)} \varphi_\sigma \right) = \log \frac{1}{|B_0(z)|}$$

in a neighborhood of $\partial D_H(a_k, \delta)$ for each $k \geq k_0$. For $\rho(z, a_k) \geq (3/4)\delta$, we have from (6.1):

$$\log \frac{1}{|B_0(z)|} \leq C_\delta + \log \frac{1}{\tanh \frac{3}{4}\delta},$$

while $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min_{D_H(a_k, \delta/2)} \varphi_\sigma = \infty$ because $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) = \infty$. So there exists k_0 so that (6.3) is achieved for $3\delta/4 \leq d(a_k, z) \leq \delta$. $\square$

6.2. Proofs.

Proof of Proposition 4:

Suppose there exists some $h \in Ha(U_+)$ such that $h(z) \geq \varphi(z) \geq 0$, for any $z \in U_+$. Then Harnack's inequality implies that if $z, w \in U_+$ are such that $\rho(z, w) < 2\delta$, we have $h(w) \geq C'_\delta h(z)$.

Provided k_0 is large enough, we have $|x| + y \leq 2x_k$ for any $x + iy \in D_H(a_k, \delta/2)$, so that $\min_{D_H(a_k, \delta/2)} \varphi_\sigma \geq \sigma(2x_k)$. Harnack's inequality as used above then yields

$$h(z) \geq C'_\delta \sigma(2x_k), \text{ for all } z \in D_H(a_k, 2\delta).$$

Take any $x \leq x_{k_0}$. There is a unique $k \geq k_0 + 1$ such that $x_{k+1} \leq x < x_k$. Since the whole curve γ is covered by the disks $D_H(a_j, 2\delta)$ we have either $x \in D_H(a_{k+1}, 2\delta)$ and $h(z) \geq C'_\delta \sigma(2x_{k+1}) \geq C'_\delta \sigma(2x)$, or $x \in D_H(a_k, 2\delta)$ and $h(z) \geq C'_\delta \sigma(2x_k)$; in this latter case we have

$$x_k > x \geq x_k - Cf(x_k) \geq \frac{1}{2}x_k$$

for k_0 large enough. So in each case we have

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{1}{C'_\delta} h(x + if(x)) \geq \sigma(4x), \text{ for any } x \leq x_{k_0}.$$

On the other hand, there exists $c > 0$ and a positive measure μ on the real line with $\int \frac{d\mu(t)}{1+t^2} < \infty$ such that

$$h_1(x + iy) := \frac{1}{C'_\delta} h(x + iy) = cy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} P_y(x - t) d\mu(t),$$

where $P_y(t) := \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{y}{y^2 + t^2}$ stands for the Poisson kernel. In particular, if $|x| \leq 1$, $y \leq 1$,

$$h_1(x + iy) \leq \int_{-2}^2 P_y(x - t) d\mu(t) + c + \int_{|t| \geq 2} \frac{1}{1 + t^2} d\mu(t) \leq \int_{-2}^2 P_y(x - t) d\mu(t) + C_2.$$

Therefore, again for k_0 large enough, (6.4) implies

$$\int_{-2}^2 P_{f(x)}(x - t) d\mu(t) \geq h_1(x + if(x)) - C_2 \geq \sigma(4x) - C_2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma(4x).$$

Hence

$$(6.5) \quad \int_0^1 \sigma(4x) dx \leq 2 \int_{-2}^2 \left(\int_0^1 P_{f(x)}(x - t) dx \right) d\mu(t).$$

Now we choose $f(x) = x^2$ (the choice of f is inessential here). We claim that $\int_0^1 P_{x^2}(x - t) dx \leq C$. Indeed, let

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \frac{x^2}{(x - t)^2 + x^4} dx \\ &= \int_{0 \leq x \leq 1, |x - t| \leq t^2/4} \frac{x^2}{(x - t)^2 + x^4} dx + \int_{0 \leq x \leq 1, t^2/4 \leq |x - t| \leq t} \frac{x^2}{(x - t)^2 + x^4} dx + \int_{0 \leq x \leq 1, t \leq |x - t|} \frac{x^2}{(x - t)^2 + x^4} dx \\ &=: I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \int_{|x - t| \leq t^2/4} \frac{dx}{x^2} \leq 2(t^2/4)(4/t^2) \leq 2, \\ II &\leq \int_{t^2/4 \leq |x - t| \leq t} \frac{x^2 dx}{(x - t)^2} \leq Ct^2 \int_{t^2/4 \leq |x - t|} \frac{dx}{(x - t)^2} \leq Ct^2(t^2/4)^{-1} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and, since $t \leq |x - t|$ implies that $|x - t| \geq x/2$,

$$III \leq \int_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \frac{x^2}{(x/2)^2 + x^4} dx \leq 4.$$

The claim is proved.

Finally, (6.5) together with the claim says that

$$\int_0^1 \sigma(4x) dx \leq C \int_{-2}^2 d\mu(t) < \infty,$$

therefore $\int_0^1 \sigma(x) dx < \infty$.

Now we choose $\sigma := s^{-1}$, where s is the function given in Proposition 4. Since $\int_0^1 \sigma(x) dx \geq \int_{s^{-1}(1)}^\infty s(t) dt$, we have a contradiction with $\int_1^\infty s(t) dt = \infty$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5:

We construct a function φ as above with $\sigma(t) = t^{-2}$. If there was a harmonic h such that $h \geq \varphi$, Harnack's inequality would imply as before (6.4), which is impossible

because we would have $Mh(\xi) \geq C\xi^{-2}$ for $\xi > 0$ and small enough, which is not a weakly integrable function.

We must now check the growth property for φ . As we have seen before, if $z \notin \bigcup_{k \geq k_0} D_H(a_k, \delta)$, then $\varphi(z)$ is bounded by a constant. So we can restrict ourselves to points in a hyperbolic neighborhood of the curve γ .

For points $z \in \gamma$ with $z = x + if(x)$, $x \leq x_{k_0}$,

$$\varphi(z) \leq \varphi_\sigma(x + if(x)) = \sigma(x + f(x)) \leq \sigma(x),$$

therefore on the curve γ we have $\varphi(x + iy) \leq \sigma(f^{-1}(y))$.

In general, there is a x' such that $z = x + iy \in D_H(x' + if(x'), \delta)$, and $\varphi(z) \leq \varphi(x' + if(x')) \leq \sigma(x')$. Now $y \leq Cf(x')$, so

$$\varphi(z) \leq \sigma(x') \leq \sigma(f^{-1}(y/C)).$$

With our choice of σ , one can check that choosing any f so that

$$f(\xi) \leq \frac{1}{C}s^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\xi^2}\right)$$

will yield $\varphi(z) \leq s(y)$, q.e.d. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [CR] Cole, B. J. and Ransford, T. J. “Jensen measures and harmonic measures”, J. Reine Angew. Math. (to appear)
- [Es] Essén, M. “On minimal thinness, reduced functions and Green potentials”, Proc. Edin. Math. Soc. **36** (1992), 87–106.
- [Gr] Green, J. W. “Approximately subharmonic functions”, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1952), 829–833.
- [HMNT] Hartmann, A., Massaneda, X., Nicolau, A., and Thomas, P. J. “Interpolation in the Nevanlinna class and harmonic majorants”, manuscript, 28 pp.
- [HU] Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B. “Extension of Lipschitz Functions”, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **77** (1980), no. 2, 539–554.
- [Ko] Koosis, P. “La plus petite majorante surharmonique et son rapport avec l’existence des fonctions entières de type exponentiel jouant le rôle de multiplicateurs”, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **33** (1983), 1–39.
- [McS] McShane, E. J. “Extension of range of functions”, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **40** (1934), 837–842.
- [PT1] Pau, J., and Thomas, P. J. “Decrease of bounded holomorphic functions along discrete sets”, prépublication no. 217, Laboratoire Emile Picard, Université Paul Sabatier (Toulouse), june 2001, 14 pp.
- [PT2] Pau, J., and Thomas, P. J. “Decrease of bounded holomorphic functions along discrete sets” [revised version], electronically available from math arXiv : <http://arXiv.org/abs/math.CV/0106048>. To appear in Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.
- [Ra] Ransford, T. J. “Jensen measures”, in : *Approximation, Complex Analysis and Potential Theory* (Montréal, Qc, 2000), 221–237, NATO Sci. Sér. II, Math-Phys-Chem 37, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2001.
- [St] Stoll, M. *Invariant Potential Theory in the Unit Ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$* , London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 199, Cambridge University Press, London, 1994.
- [Ul] Ulrich, D. “Radial limits of $\mathcal{M}$ -subharmonic functions”, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 292 (1985), 501–518.

Alexander.Borichev@math.u-bordeaux.fr

Artur Nicolau, Departament de Matemàtiques, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain.
artur@mat.uab.es

Pascal J. Thomas, Laboratoire de Mathématiques Emile Picard, UMR CNRS 5580, Université Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse CEDEX, France.
pthomas@cict.fr